

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in response to an outstanding Final Office Action dated March 4, 2008. The shortened statutory period for response expires on June 4, 2008; therefore, this Response is timely submitted and does not require payment of extension fees. This Response is submitted concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination and the necessary fees.

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-35 are pending in the application with claims 21, 26, and 31 in independent form. Applicant hereby cancels claims 1-20 and adds new claims 21-35.

II. Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiners for taking the time to meet with Applicant to discuss the application and outstanding office action. During the interview, Applicant presented the Examiners a proposed new claim. Applicant has included the proposed new claim discussed during the interview as new claim 21. Applicant respectfully references the Interview Summary of April 24, 2008 for the statement: “The Examiners agreed that the narrowed claim as proposed seemed to distinguish over the Tonkin reference.” An additional change is made to elements (a) and (d) to clarify that the user inputs the information on graphical user interface screens. A change is made to element (e) to clarify that “one or more” clip-art images can be proportionally enlarged. Also, a change is made to element (g) to clarify that “one or more” indicia are automatically generated on the title “page,” and first and second story pages. Applicant has drafted new independent method claim 26 and kit claim 31 with similar language.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action of March 4, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,134,568 to Tonkin (“Tonkin”). Applicant respectfully asserts the Examiner’s rejection is rendered moot in light of Applicant’s cancellation of claims 1-20.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Tonkin does not show or suggest at least “(e) automatically generating a first story page from the one or more clip-art images from the second set of inputs for printing on the second leaf’s back-side and *automatically*

proportionally enlarging the one or more clip-art images from the second set of inputs on the first story page to a maximum size that does not overlap margins of the first story page;” “(f) *automatically generating a second story page from the second set of inputs* for printing on a third leaf’s front-side including the one or more clip-art images and the corresponding text, wherein the one or more clip-art images and corresponding text appear oriented in *diametric contraposition* to the one or more images on the first story page;” “(g) *automatically generating one or more indicia* on the title page and first and second story pages for *indicating how to assemble the second story page in diametric contraposition to the first story page;*” or “(h) allowing the user to print the cover page, the title page, and the first and second story pages, *wherein the first and second story pages are printed for binding the second story page in diametric contraposition to the first story page,*” as stated in independent claim 21.

Tonkin also does not show or suggest “(f) automatically generating, using said software program, a first story page from the one or more clip-art images from the second set of inputs for printing on the second leaf’s back-side and *automatically proportionally enlarging* the one or more clip-art images from the second set of inputs on the first story page to a maximum size that does not overlap margins of the first story page;” “(g) *automatically generating, using said software program, a second story page from the second set of inputs* for printing on a third leaf’s front-side including the one or more clip-art images and the corresponding text, wherein the one or more clip-art images and corresponding text appear oriented in *diametric contraposition* to the one or more images on the first story page;” “(h) *automatically generating, using said software program, one or more indicia* on the title page and first and second story pages for *indicating how to assemble the second story page in diametric contraposition to the first story page;*” or “(i) printing, using said software program, the cover

page, the title page, and the first and second story pages, *wherein the first and second story pages are printed for binding the second story page in diametric contraposition to the first story page,*” as stated in independent claim 26.

Moreover, Tonkin does not show or suggest “(e) automatically generating a first story page from the one or more clip-art images from the second set of inputs for printing on the second leaf’s back-side and *automatically proportionally enlarging* the one or more clip-art images from the second set of inputs on the first story page to a maximum size that does not overlap margins of the first story page;” “(f) *automatically generating a second story page from the second set of inputs* for printing on a third leaf’s front-side including the one or more clip-art images and the corresponding text, wherein the one or more clip-art images and corresponding text appear oriented in *diametric contraposition* to the one or more images on the first story page;” “(g) *automatically generating one or more indicia* on the title page and first and second story pages *for indicating how to assemble the second story page in diametric contraposition to the first story page;*” or “(h) allowing the user to print the cover page, the title page, and the first and second story pages, *wherein the first and second story pages are printed for binding the second story page in diametric contraposition to the first story page,*” as stated in independent claim 31.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claims 21, 26, and 31 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over Tonkin.

IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action of March 4, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 10, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonkin, in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,210,172 to Clements (“Clements”). Applicant respectfully asserts that the cancellation to

claims 1-20 renders the rejection moot. In addition, for at least the reasons stated above, Tonkin or Clements, alone or in combination, does not show or suggest the elements of newly added independent claims 21, 25, and 31 or the claims depending therefrom.

V. Support for New Claims

Support for the additional limitations found in new claim 21 can at least be found as follows: the “graphical user interface screens” are depicted in Figures 1 through 4 (Figure 1 is an example of a first graphical user interface screen, Figure 4 is an example of a second graphical user interface screen) and described at page 3, lines 13-14; inputs for “clip-art images” are found at page 6, line 19 to page 7, line 1; “leafs” are described at page 1, line 8 to 15 and page 3, line 3 to 5; “story pages” are described in Figures 4 through 5 and at page 7, lines 7 to 13, page 10, lines 17 to 19, page 12 lines 15 to 16, and page 13 lines 11 to 21; and support for “automatically proportionally enlarging the one or more clip-art images” can be found at page 8, lines 18-22.

VI. Request for Reconsideration

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance is requested. If a conference would assist in placing this application in better condition for allowance, the undersigned asks that the Examiner please call the undersigned at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Blake E. Reese
Reg. No.: 57,688

May 12, 2008

Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP
1 Chase Manhattan Plaza
New York, NY 10005-1413
(212) 530-5000 / (212) 530-5219 (facsimile)